30th October 1931]

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know, Sir, the number of officers who have been drawing fixed travelling allowance after this question was given notice of?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"I should like to have notice of the question."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know whether the question of fixed travelling allowances is being considered by the Retrenchment Committee?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"Yes, Sir."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"Have they finished the consideration, Sir?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"They have made certain recommendations to Government on the subject."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"May I know whether these recommendations will be placed on the table of the House?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"In due course the House will know them."

Mr. BASHEER AHMED SAYEED:—"Will they let the Council know before they take any decision on them?"

The hon. Mr. H. G. STOKES:—"It rests with the Government."

Madras Record Office

Appointment of an I.C.S. Officer as Curator, Madras Record Office.

*264 *Q.*—Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that an I.C.S. Officer was appointed as Curator of the Madras Record Office in the year 1930 with the object of preparing a manual on revenue records;

(*b*) whether it is a fact that, subsequent to the appointment of the I.C.S. Officer as Curator, an additional staff of nine clerks was sanctioned to assist him in his special work;

(*c*) whether it is a fact that on the request of the Curator, the Government sanctioned a special pay of Rs. 10 per mensem to the senior clerk of the special staff;

(*d*) what is the annual expenditure on the Madras Record Office before the appointment of the I.C.S. Officer with the special staff and the annual expenditure on the same after the appointment of the I.C.S. Officer with the special staff;

(*e*) whether the Government propose to abolish the office of Curator as a measure of retrenchment; and

(*f*) what would be the saving effected as a result of abolishing the office of Curator?

A.—(*a*), (*b*) & (*c*) Yes.

(*d*) The annual expenditure for the Madras Record Office prior to the appointment of the Special Officer and his staff is Rs. 60,696 and the expenditure as anticipated in the Budget Estimates for 1931–32, i.e., after the appointment of the Special Officer and his staff, is Rs. 1,08,600.

(*e*) The Government have decided to retain the office of Curator until the end of the current year. The question of its further continuance will be considered in due course.

(*f*) The savings in a full year would be about Rs. 39,300.

Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar :—" With reference to the answer to clause (*e*) of the question, may I know whether that question was considered by the Retrenchment Committee? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes :—" The Retrenchment Committee has not examined the Record Office."

Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar :—" Will they be considering it, Sir? "

The hon. Mr. H. G. Stokes :—" No doubt, they will."

Pensions

Grant of an extra sum of Rs. 2 for pensioners.

* 265 *Q.*—Mr. M. A. Manikkavelu Nayakar : Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the civil pensioners were granted an extra sum of Rs. 2 per head from the year 1921;

(*b*) to which class of pensioners such extra amount was allowed, whether to those drawing a pension of less than Rs. 20 per month or even to those who drew more than Rs. 20 per month;

(*c*) why this extra sum of Rs. 2 per head per month was cancelled from after February 1931; and

(*d*) whether the Government propose to reconsider their order in the case of all pensioners drawing less than Rs. 10?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The details[a] of the scheme relating to the grant of temporary increases to pensioners in receipt of pensions up to Rs. 45 a month which was sanctioned at first temporarily for three years from 1st November 1920 are given in the appendix.

(*c*) The question of varying or abolishing the temporary increases was considered in 1926, and the Government sanctioned the continuance of the increases in the case of pensioners in receipt of a superior pension subject to the condition that they would be abolished if the cost of living index figure as given in the *Bombay Labour Gazette* published by the Labour Office, Secretariat, Bombay, remained below 125 points for three consecutive months. As the cost of living index figure fell below 125 points and remained so for three consecutive months orders were issued discontinuing with effect from 1st March 1931 the grant of increases to pensioners in receipt of a superior pension. In 1926 the addition given to inferior pensions was made permanent and was unaffected by the order of 1931.

(*d*) No.

---

[a] Printed as Appendix VIII on page 143 infra.